

MICHIGAN TRIAL COURT CONSOLIDATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS: 2001 FOLLOW-UP ASSESSMENT REPORT

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
 Part One. Follow-Up Assessment Overview and Summary	
I. Introduction	1
II. Follow-up Assessment Methodology.....	2
III. Findings and Recommendations	4
A. General and Specific Assessment Findings.....	5
B. Recommendations	9
 Part Two. Have the Demonstration Projects Met the Specific Goals of Trial Court Consolidation in Michigan?	
IV. Have the Demonstration Projects Promoted the Efficient Use of Judicial and Quasi-Judicial Resources?.....	12
A. Do judges and judicial officers dispose of cases within established time guidelines?.....	13
B. Are judges and judicial officers used to the full extent allowed?.....	14
C. Does the court centrally coordinate its ADR programs?	16
D. Is a single system used for jury administration?.....	17
E. Does the court have an established scheduling policy and coordinate all judicial schedules?	18
V. Have the Demonstration Projects Hastened the Delivery of Justice to Families?	20
A. Are family cases resolved within established time guidelines?	21
B. Is the court able to coordinate adjudication of related family cases?	22
VI. Have the Demonstration Projects Reduced Operational Costs?	25
A. Have the net aggregate costs of court operations been reduced or managed more efficiently?	26
B. Does the court submit and administer a single budget?	28
C. Can the court reallocate budget funds between various divisions within the funding unit agreement?	29

Table of Contents (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
D. Does the court maintain single contracts for services, such as for indigent counsel?	30
E. Can the court enforce its judgments, including financial obligations, effectively?	30
VII. Have the Demonstration Projects Reduced the Age and Size of Pending Inventory?	31
A. Is the age of pending cases within established guidelines?	32
B. Is the pending inventory of cases within established guidelines?	34
C. Does the court maintain a high degree of trial date certainty?	38
VIII. Have the Demonstration Projects Employed Technology Productively to Enhance Scheduling and Information Exchange?	39
A. Can all cases be accessed through the court's automated case management system?	40
B. Does the court maintain a single case management system using a standard operating system, hardware platform, and peripheral devices?	40
C. Is a single access point available for external customers to obtain case-related information?	41
D. Does the court follow standards for office automation applications and equipment?	42
E. Can external agencies electronically exchange information with the court through a single point?	42
F. Can court staff access appropriate case management information through a single system?	43
G. Are technical innovations adopted by the court available to all divisions that can utilize them?	44
H. Does the court's case management system include functionality for efficient, coordinated scheduling of people and events?	44
IX. Have the Demonstration Projects Promoted Strong Court Leadership through Consensus Decision-making Led by the Chief Judge?	46
A. Has a single chief judge has been assigned to the trial court by the Supreme Court?	47
B. Has the court established a judicial council or similar governing body that is representative of the various divisions of the court?	48
C. Is the court's governing body the single decision-making authority for labor relations and personnel management?	49

Table of Contents (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
D. Do the court's governing body and its members represent the court as a single entity?	49
E. Is the court regarded as a single entity by outside agencies and individuals?..	49
X. Global Conclusions of Key Stakeholders About Demonstration Projects	50
A. Stakeholder Ratings on Specific Outcome Measures.....	50
B. Stakeholder Ratings of Overall Project Success.....	51

Appendices

	<u>Page</u>
A. Summary of Responses to Michigan Trial Court Consolidation Checklist	A-1
B. Court Consolidation Status Report and Checklist for Barry County Demonstration Project.....	B-1
C. Court Consolidation Status Report and Checklist for Berrien County Demonstration Project.....	C-1
D. Court Consolidation Status Report and Checklist for Iron County Demonstration Project.....	D-1
E. Court Consolidation Status Report and Checklist for Isabella County Demonstration Project.....	E-1
F. Court Consolidation Status Report and Checklist for Lake County Demonstration Project.....	F-1
G. Court Consolidation Status Report and Checklist for Washtenaw County Demonstration Project.....	G-1
H. Court Consolidation Status Report and Checklist for 46 th Circuit Demonstration Project.....	H-1
I. Grand Summary of Key Stakeholder Survey Responses for All Court Consolidation Demonstration Projects, by Court	I-1
J. Grand Summary of Key Stakeholder Survey Responses for All Court Consolidation Demonstration Projects, by Stakeholder Group	J-1
K. Results of Key Stakeholder Survey for Barry County Court Consolidation Demonstration Project	K-1
L. Results of Key Stakeholder Survey for Berrien County Court Consolidation Demonstration Project	L-1
M. Results of Key Stakeholder Survey for Iron County Court Consolidation Demonstration Project	M-1

Appendices (continued)

Page

N.	Results of Key Stakeholder Survey for Isabella County Court Consolidation Demonstration Project	N-1
O.	Results of Key Stakeholder Survey for Lake County Court Consolidation Demonstration Project	O-1
P.	Results of Key Stakeholder Survey for Washtenaw County Court Consolidation Demonstration Project	P-1
Q.	Results of Key Stakeholder Survey For Court Consolidation Demonstration Project In 46 th Circuit	Q-1
R.	Tables and Charts Showing Caseload Trends in Barry County Demonstration Court	R-1
S.	Tables and Charts Showing Caseload Trends in Berrien County Demonstration Court	S-1
T.	Tables and Charts Showing Caseload Trends in Iron County Demonstration Court	T-1
U.	Tables and Charts Showing Caseload Trends in Isabella County Demonstration Court	U-1
V.	Tables and Charts Showing Caseload Trends in Lake County Demonstration Court	V-1
W.	Tables and Charts Showing Caseload Trends in Washtenaw County Demonstration Court	W-1
X.	Tables and Charts Showing Caseload Trends in 46th Circuit Demonstration Court	X-1
Y.	Demonstration Court Cases Beyond Time Guidelines, as Reported in Speedy Trial Reports for Circuit and District Courts.....	Y-1
Z.	General Findings on Court Budgeting in 1999 NCSC Evaluation of Demonstration Projects	Z-1
AA.	Caseload Management Data for Barry County Demonstration Project.....	AA-1
BB.	Caseload Management Data for Berrien County Demonstration Project.....	BB-1
CC.	Caseload Management Data for Iron County Demonstration Project.....	CC-1
DD.	Caseload Management Data for Isabella County Demonstration Project.....	DD-1
EE.	Caseload Management Data for Lake County Demonstration Project.....	EE-1
FF.	Caseload Management Data for Washtenaw County Demonstration Project.....	FF-1

Appendices (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
GG. Caseflow Management Data for 46th Circuit Demonstration Project.....	GG-1
HH. Budget, Revenue and Expenditure Data for Barry County Demonstration Project.....	HH-1
II. Revenue/Expenditure Data for Berrien County Demonstration Project	II-1
JJ. Budget, Revenue and Expenditure Data for Iron County Demonstration Project.....	JJ-1
KK. Budget, Revenue and Expenditure Data for Isabella County Demonstration Project.....	KK-1
LL. Expenditure Data for Lake County Demonstration Project	LL-1
MM. Budget, Revenue and Expenditure Data for Washtenaw County Demonstration Project.....	MM-1
NN. Budget, Revenue and Expenditure Data for 46th Circuit Demonstration Project.....	NN-1